

REMARKS

Claims 33, 35, 53, 55, and 78-85 are pending in the application, claims 34, 37-52, 54, 56-77 having been cancelled by the above amendment, and new claims 78-85 having been added. The limitation added to claim 33 is supported by, for example, page 34, lines 5 to 27, and page 49, line 21 to page 52, line 30 of the specification. Claim 35, which depends from claim 33, is amended to delete the limitation that now appears in claim 33. Claims 33 and 35 no longer recite "analog thereof". Support for new claims 78 and 79 appears in the specification on, for example, page 7, lines 14-32, and page 11, lines 16-18. Support for new claims 80-85 appears in the specification on, for example, page 35, lines 25-32. No new matter has been added.

Applicants (represented by Janis K. Fraser and Andrew W. Torrance) thank Examiner (Michael Pak) and his Supervisor (Yvonne Eyler) for the helpful telephonic interview held on February 14, 2002, during which an amendment and reply substantially similar to the instant one was discussed. During this interview, the Examiner requested that Applicants provide several pieces of information to assist his further examination of the application. First, he requested the publication date of the Ebisawa *et al.* reference mentioned in the Office Action at page 3. According to the publisher, the journal volume containing this paper was mailed on July 2, 1994. Second, he requested confirmation that there exists a significant difference in affinity between high and low affinity melatonin receptors. For this purpose, Applicants enclose a copy of the following reference: *Molecular pharmacology and function of melatonin receptor subtypes*, Dubocovich *et al.*, pages 181-190 In Melatonin after four decades: an assessment of its potential (Edited by James Olcese), Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers, New York, 2000. Applicants particularly direct the Examiner to pages 182-184 of this reference. Third, the Examiner asked Applicants to identify where in the specification a definition of "substantially identical" appears. Applicants direct the Examiner to the detailed definition in the specification at page 5, lines 7-22. Applicants hope that this information proves helpful to the Examiner in advancing prosecution.

The invention is drawn to methods of testing candidate compounds for the ability to act as agonists of high affinity melatonin receptor ligands.

All of the claims were rejected on various grounds, discussed in detail below.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112, first paragraph

Claims 33, 35, 53, 55, and 59 are rejected in the Office Action for lacking adequate written description under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. The Examiner maintained this rejection in the Advisory Action. The Office Action cites *Regents of the University of California v. Eli Lilly and Co.*, 119 F.3d 1559, 43 USPQ2d 1398 (Fed. Cir. 1997) as holding that "a generic claim to human or mammalian when only the rat protein sequence was disclosed did not have written description in the specification." (Office Action, p. 2) The Office Action then states: "Thus, the only disclosure of a specific human melatonin receptor does not have written description for the genus of human melatonin receptor whose sequences cannot be envisioned." (Office Action, p. 2)

Applicants traverse this ground for rejection. The case cited in the Office Action, *Eli Lilly and Co.*, is inapposite to the pending claims because its holding concerns written description of cDNA claims, not method claims.

In *Eli Lilly and Co.*, the claims at issue were drawn to cDNA molecules--not, as in the present case, screening assays. The court held that a claim to a genus of cDNA molecules (such as all cDNAs encoding mammalian insulin) was not adequately supported by a description of a single species within the genus, and amounted to an attempt to claim a genus of compounds by function rather than structure. The holding thus applies to claims that cover cDNAs per se, as compositions of matter. The court did not indicate that the holding was meant to apply to all claims in which DNA or genes were mentioned anywhere in the claim. Indeed, method claims often use functional language to describe the various compositions utilized in the claimed method. Such language is rarely if ever challenged as failing to meet the written description requirement, so long as the language was present in the original application as filed. To illustrate, note that the claims of the present case employ the terms "candidate compound" and "mammalian cell" as reagents utilized in the claimed methods. Such terms are very typical for screening assay claims, and do not raise written description issues even though no description of the compound's or cell's actual structure is provided in the specification. While a composition claim drawn to a "candidate compound" or a "mammalian cell" itself would obviously require

substantial further description in order to be patentable, method claims can and often do specify reagents with no additional written description of the reagents beyond general or functional language. There is certainly nothing in the *Eli Lilly and Co.* opinion to indicate that the court intended to change that widespread practice just because a reagent used in a claimed screening assay is a DNA molecule. Thus, there is no basis for trying to fit the present case under the holding in *Eli Lilly and Co.*. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112, second paragraph

Claims 33, 35, 53, 55, and 59 are rejected in the Office Action for being indefinite under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. The Examiner maintained these rejections in the Advisory Action.

The Office Action states that all the claims “encompass fragments and analogs the metes and bounds are not clear because no structural limitations are provided.” (Office Action, p. 2) Applicants have amended claims 33, 35, and 53 to remove references to “analog”, but traverse this ground for rejection as it applies to “fragments”, and assert that the meaning of “fragment” in the specification and claims is clear and not at all indefinite. A fragment of a protein is a piece of the protein, nothing more or less. A “melatonin-binding fragment of a high-affinity melatonin receptor protein” is a piece of that protein that can bind melatonin. There is nothing the slightest bit unclear about the term. Contrary to the Examiner’s assertion that “the metes and bounds are not clear because no structural limitations are provided” (Office Action, p. 2), Applicants point out that the term “fragment” is a structural limitation in that a fragment of a protein is by definition a subset of contiguous amino acids of the full-length protein. In the telephonic, interview the Examiner agreed to withdraw this rejection.

The Office Action also states that claims 57 and 59 “encompass the term ‘hybridizes under the condition of high stringency’, the metes and bounds are not clear because it is a relative term.” (Office Action, p. 2) Applicants disagree, particularly in view of the definition of “high stringency” provided in the specification. However, in order to advance prosecution, Applicants have cancelled claims 57 and 59, and added new claims 80-85 that specifically assimilate the stringency conditions recited in the specification on page 35, lines 25-32.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections.

Applicant : Steven Repper *et al.*
Serial No. : 09/226,046
Filed : January 5, 1999
Page : 8

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

Claim 33 is rejected in the Office Action for being anticipated by Ying *et al.* under 35 U.S.C. §102(b). The Examiner maintained this rejection in the Advisory Action and did not enter the proposed amendments. However, during the telephonic interview Examiner agreed to withdraw this rejection in light of Applicants' proposed amendment to claim 33. Applicants have amended claim 33 (by assimilating a limitation from dependent claim 35) to specify that the cell is transfected with an expression vector encoding the receptor protein, thus adding a structural feature (that is, the presence of the expression vector) clearly not present in the Ying *et al.* reference. Withdrawal of the rejection is therefore requested.

Errors in the Advisory Action Mailed December 10, 2001

The advisory action mailed December 10, 2001, contains two errors. First, it suggests that Applicants filed a reply on August 27, 2001 (PTO-303 (Rev. 01-01), near top of page). Applicants note for the record that they last filed a reply on June 27, 2001. Second, the advisory action suggests that a notice of appeal was filed on August 17, 2001 (PTO-303 (Rev. 01-01), near middle of page). Applicants note for the record that they filed a notice of appeal on August 24, 2001.

Applicant : Steven Repper
Serial No. : 09/226,046
Filed : January 5, 1999
Page : 9

Attorney's Doc. No.: 10217-250003 / MGH-0823.3;
BMS X22c

Attached is a marked-up version of the changes being made by the current amendment. Applicants believe that all claims are now in condition for allowance, and ask that all claims be allowed. Enclosed are a Request for Continued Examination, a Petition for Five-Month Extension of Time, and checks for \$740 and \$1,960 to cover the respective fees. Please apply any other charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:

March 22, 2002

Janis K. Fraser, Ph.D., J.D.
Reg. No. 34,819

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110-2804
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906

20210188.doc

Version with markings to show changes made

In the claims:

Claims 33, 35, and 53 have been amended as follows:

33. (Twice amended) A method of testing a candidate compound for the ability to act as an agonist of a high affinity melatonin receptor ligand, said method comprising:

a) contacting said candidate compound with a mammalian cell which expresses on its surface a recombinant high-affinity melatonin receptor protein or melatonin binding fragment [or analog]thereof, said cell having been transfected with an expression vector encoding said receptor protein or fragment thereof;

b) measuring intracellular cAMP concentration in said cell; and

c) where said contacting causes a decrease in intracellular cAMP concentration, identifying said candidate compound as an agonist of a high affinity melatonin receptor ligand.

35. (Twice amended) The method of claim 33,[wherein said mammalian cell is transfected with an expression vector encoding the receptor protein or fragment or analog thereof, and] wherein in the absence of the expression vector, the mammalian cell presents substantially no high-affinity melatonin receptor on its surface.

53. (Once amended) A method of testing a candidate compound for the ability to act as an agonist of a high affinity melatonin receptor ligand, said method comprising:

a) contacting said candidate compound with a cell comprising an expression vector encoding a high-affinity melatonin receptor protein comprising an amino acid sequence substantially identical to SEQ ID NO:12, or a melatonin binding fragment [or analog]thereof, wherein the cell expresses on its surface said high-affinity melatonin receptor protein or melatonin binding fragment [or analog]thereof;

b) measuring intracellular cAMP concentration in said cell; and

c) where said contacting causes a decrease in intracellular cAMP concentration,

identifying said candidate compound as an agonist of a high affinity melatonin receptor ligand.